> array is made, a correlation of the location of an individual site on the array with the bead or bioactive agent at that particular site can be made. This means that the beads may, once the array is loaded with the beads, the array can be decoded, or can ***be randomly distributed on the array, a fast and inexpensive process as compared to either the in situ synthesis or spotting techniques of the prior art...*** with full or partial decoding occurring after testing, as is more fully outlined below.
>
> And at Col. 17, line 47 et seq.:
>
> The microspheres are then placed in the wells 250 in step 276 according to a number of different techniques. The placement of the microspheres may be accomplished by dripping a solution containing the ***desired randomly mixed subpopulations of the microspheres over*** the distal end 212, sonicating the bundle to settle the microspheres in the wells, and allowing the microsphere solvent to evaporate. Alternatively, the subpopulations could be added serially to the bundle end. Microspheres 10 may then be fixed into the wells 250 by using a dilute solution of sulfonated Nafion that is dripped over the end.

Random distribution of beads into the wells in the ends of microtubules (as in Walt et al.) is inconsistent with Anderson et al.'s method, where columns of gel containing microbeads must be colored to indicate the antibody attached to the microbeads in a particular column. In Anderson et al.'s method, one cannot randomly distribute microbeads among different columns of the gels, otherwise one would not be able to decode the final product, as you would not know which gel contained which type of microbead (and which antibody). In contrast, in Walt et al., the microspheres are themselves encoded to identify the attached biomolecule, so random distribution of the microspheres into the wells in the fibers does allow decoding of the final array. Accordingly, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Anderson et al. with Walt et al., and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Regarding the amendment to claim 92, it is noted that the specification at paras. 55 to 71 discusses a variety of ways to provide gels with embedded microbeads, including, but not limited to embodiments where a LEAPS cell is used to confine the polymerizable mixture before polymerization. In other embodiments described, the mixture is not "confined" between two planar surfaces, even where a LEAPS cell is used. And in yet other embodiments, it is clear that a LEAPS cell is optional. Accordingly, the amended claim 92 is fully supported.

In conclusion, all rejections have been overcome, and allowance of the application is respectfully sought.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _____ By: _____

Eric P. Mirabel
Registration No. 31,211

Correspondence Address::
Bioarray Solutions
35 Technology Drive
Warren New Jersey 07059
Telephone 908 226 8200 Ext 203
Facsimile: 908 226 0800

Applicant hereby petitions for any petition required to make this submission timely and in compliance with applicable rules. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees due in connection with this submission and not otherwise covered by payment included herewith, or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 502088.